REMARKS:

Claims 1-20 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, so that the claims are now believed to be in proper form.

Claim 1 has also been amended to clearing distinguish the invention both structurally and functionally over the prior art cited by the Examiner by defining a plasma treatment arrangement with a vacuum process chamber including two electrodes arranged at a distance from each other with a plasma discharge produced between the electrodes for treatment of a workpiece in the chamber. The electrodes are connected to the two connections of the secondary winding of the transformer. This necessarily results in a bipolar voltage that is transferred to the secondary winding of the transformer and thus transferred to the electrodes in a way that these electrodes will be operated with alternating polarity so that consequently one electrode operates as cathode and the other electrode as anode in a periodically alternating fashion. With this arrangement electrical charging on surfaces of the electrodes are inhibited since an exchange of charges is occurring, caused by reversing the polarity at the electrodes and creating short circuiting of the electrodes during the repeated zero crossing of the voltage. The frequency of the bipolar voltage from the generator is in the range from 1.0 to 500 kHz as is also claimed.

These features of the claimed invention that are both structural and functional, clearly define over Kohler (U.S. Patent 5,464,667) and Mark (U.S. Patent 5,303,139), taken separately or in any combination.

Neither of the references teach or suggest electrodes that are directly connected to the secondary windings of a transformer (Fig. 4 of the present specification) and that this winding forms a short circuit within the current loop with the electrodes (plasma discharge).

The claimed arrangement was carefully designed for deposition of high quality oxide thin films. Nowhere in the cited prior art is such a configuration disclosed and certainly not with the various design values and applications defined by independent claim 1, as well as its those defined by the dependent claims.

The Examiner has picked together claim elements and combined them with no technologically sound reason for making the combination and no expectations of what might actually result, let alone demonstrating that the claimed invention wound obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, even as interpreted by *KSR v. Teleflex*. Nowhere in the cited prior art is a hint given to make such combinations, especially because the task of the invention is also very different. The invention is not directed to a Power Supply but it is directed to a solution to the problem of producing oxide films by using a reactive plasma process. This has to be considered as a whole in determining what the person of ordinary skill in the art can make in an obvious may from the prior art.

It is important that the windings short circuit the plasma discharge between two pulses. Reactive deposition of oxides with high rates was always a problem to be overcome for a long time. The invention presents a novel and unobvious solution which was clearly not a matter of course to find.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added since each of the claim limitations can be found in the specification as filed.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, to advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/PETER C MICHALOS/
Peter C. Michalos
Reg. No. 28,643
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: May 23, 2008

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706

R:\PATAMD\J423-019\J423-019-Amend.wpd